

1 Susan E. Coleman (SBN 171832)
E-mail: scoleman@bwslaw.com
2 Lauren S. Dossey (SBN 244887)
E-mail: ldossey@bwslaw.com
3 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP
444 South Flower Street, 40th Floor
4 Los Angeles, California 90071-2942
Tel: 213.236.0600 Fax: 213.236.2700

Attorneys for Defendant CALEB GARCIA ALAMILLA

HYDEE FELDSTEIN SOTO, City Attorney (SBN 106866)
7 DENISE C. MILLS, Chief Deputy City Attorney (SBN 191992)
KATHLEEN KENEALY, Chief Assistant City Attorney (SBN 212289)
8 TY A. FORD, Deputy City Attorney (SBN 218365)
200 North Main Street, 6th Floor, City Hall East
9 Los Angeles, CA 90012
Tel: 213.978.6900 Fax: 213.978.8785
10 Email: Ty.Ford@lacity.org

11 Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS
ANGELES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

16 ALEXANDRA RASEY-SMITH;
17 GORDON GENE MACCANI; and
JANET MACCANI,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 | v.

20 CITY OF LOS ANGELES; CALEB
GARCIA ALAMILLA; and DOES 2-
21 10, inclusive.

22 | Defendants

Case No. 2:24-cv-03265-MWC-SSC

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF
GENUINE DISPUTES OF
MATERIAL FACT [LR 56-3]**

Filed concurrently with Reply ISO Motion for Partial Summary Judgment

Judge: Hon. Michelle Williams Court

Date: January 16, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Trial Date: April 6, 2026

25 Defendants hereby submit this Response to Plaintiffs' Statement of Genuine
26 Disputes of Material Fact together with references to evidence in support of
27 Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment:

28 //

UNCONTROVERTED FACTS & SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
<p>1. On February 3, 2024, at approximately 2:20 p.m., Los Angeles Police Department received a call for service regarding an assault with a deadly weapon in progress at a studio in an industrial complex in the Skid Row area of downtown Los Angeles.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶¶ 2–3; Chomuk Decl. ¶¶ 2–3</p>	<p>1. Disputed.</p> <p><i>Objection:</i> Relevance, Defendant Garcia did not hear the 911 call prior to shooting Decedent. Garcia would have received the information regarding the incident from the radio dispatch communications and from the police car onboard computer.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 22:12-23:2); and Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 9:4-13)</p>
<p>1. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that the specified information from the 911 call was communicated to the responding Officers by dispatch, which is admissible to show its effect on the listener and the Officers' state of mind. The fact that the Officers did not personally hear the 911 call is irrelevant and does not create a genuine dispute of material fact.</p>	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 2. The caller reported the suspect was an adult white male who was under the influence and armed with a large stick attacking an employee. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 4	2. Disputed <i>Objection:</i> Relevance, Defendant Garcia did not hear the 911 call prior to shooting Decedent. Garcia would have received the information regarding the incident from the radio dispatch communications and from the police car onboard computer. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 22:12-23:2); and Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 9:4-13)
2. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that the specified information from the 911 call was communicated to the responding Officers by dispatch, which is admissible to show its effect on the listener and the Officers' state of mind. The fact that the Officers did not personally hear the 911 call is irrelevant and does not create a genuine dispute of material fact.	
3. Dispatch instructed the officers to respond Code 3—an emergency response requiring immediate action. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 5	3. Disputed to the extent that the radio dispatch communications to Garcia contained no information that Decedent had physically injured anyone or that Decedent was armed with a gun or a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit A (CAD Printout at 5); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 24:19-21); and Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 9:22-10:2)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 3. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' purported dispute does not controvert the stated fact. Defendants did not assert that dispatch reported any physical injury or that the Decedent was armed with a gun or knife. Plaintiffs' non-responsive argument therefore fails to create a genuine dispute of material fact, and this fact should be deemed admitted.	
8 9 4. Police Officers Garcia and Colin Chomuk responded Code 3. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 8	4. Undisputed.
10 11 12 13 14 15 5. While enroute to the location, dispatch provided additional information—that the suspect was on the fourth floor, guarding the door to the studio and preventing the reporting party from exiting. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 6	10 11 12 13 14 15 5. Disputed to the extent that the radio dispatch communications to Garcia contained no information that Decedent had physically injured anyone or that Decedent was armed with a gun or a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit A (CAD Printout at 5); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 24:19-22); and Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 9:22-10:2)
20 21 22 23 5. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' purported dispute does not controvert the stated fact. Defendants did not assert that dispatch reported any physical injury or that the Decedent was armed with a gun or knife. Plaintiffs' non-responsive argument therefore fails to create a genuine dispute of material fact, and the fact should be deemed admitted.	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 6. Reading aloud from the patrol vehicle's CAD system, Officer Chomuk read the description of the suspect as male, white, six-feet-two-inches tall, and armed with stick threatening employees. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 7	6. Disputed to the extent that the radio dispatch communications to Garcia contained no information that Decedent had physically injured anyone or that Decedent was armed with a gun or a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit A (CAD Printout at 5); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 24:19-22); and Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 9:22-10:2)
6. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' purported dispute does not controvert the stated fact. Defendants did not assert that dispatch reported any physical injury or that the Decedent was armed with a gun or knife. Plaintiffs' non-responsive argument therefore fails to create a genuine dispute of material fact, and the fact should be deemed admitted.	
7. Officers Garcia and Chomuk arrived at the location along with four other officers and a Sergeant. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 8	7. Undisputed
8. As Officers Garcia and Chomuk pulled up to the location, one of the reporting parties met them outside. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 9	8. Undisputed

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 7 8 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 9. They followed him into the building where they met with both reporting parties, who explained that a stranger (later identified as Jason Maccani) had opened the unlocked door to their work studio, entered, and began ordering them to leave in an aggressive and erratic manner. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 9	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 9. Disputed to the extent that the PR also told the police that Decedent said weird stuff like the world is ending and they need to get out of here, that Decedent did not hit anyone, that Decedent was talking nonsense and was very antsy. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam Video at 08:20-10:20); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam Video at 3:20-6:00)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 9. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' purported dispute does not controvert the stated fact. Plaintiffs' non-responsive argument (that attempts only to add information) therefore fails to create a genuine dispute of material fact, and the fact should be deemed admitted. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 10. They told officers they believed he was under the influence of drugs. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 9	10. Disputed. PR did not tell the officers on scene that Decedent was under influence and instead told them that Decedent said weird stuff like the world is ending and that Decedent was talking non-sense, which would have put the involved officers on notice that Decedent was potentially suffering from a mental health episode (especially since the incident occurred in the skid row area). <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam Video at 08:20-10:20); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam Video at 3:20-6:00)
10. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> PRs reported that the Decedent appeared under the influence, which was communicated to the responding Officers by dispatch prior to their arrival on scene. (Exhibit A: CAD Printout at timestamp 14:14:25 2/3/2024.) Whether the statement that the Decedent appeared under the influence was reported directly from the PRs to the responding Officers or via dispatch is irrelevant and does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs' reference to additional statements regarding bizarre or nonsensical behavior does not negate that officers were informed of suspected drug influence prior to encountering the Decedent. Plaintiffs' assertion that additional information "would have put officers on notice" of a mental health episode is speculative and irrelevant argument, not evidence.	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
<p>4 5 6 7 11. They informed the responding officers that they wanted the intruder removed, and signed a private-persons-arrest form authorizing them to arrest the intruder for trespass.</p> <p>8 9 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 10</p>	<p>11. Disputed that the PR signed a private persons arrest form authorizing them to arrest the intruder which is why a copy of this document is not attached as an exhibit.</p> <p>12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 17:7-21)</p>
<p>11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' response does not controvert the fact that the PRs authorized the arrest of the Decedent for trespass. Officers' body-worn camera footage shows the PRs requesting the intruder's removal, agreeing to have him arrested for trespass, and agreeing to sign a private person's arrest form. (Exhibit B: Jauregui Body Cam Video at 09:42-10:00). The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i>, 117 F.4th 1130, 1133 (9th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i>, 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'"').</p> <p>20 21 22 The cited deposition testimony (Exhibit M: Quintero Depo. at 17:7-21) states only that the witness did not recall whether any document was actually signed. This is irrelevant and does not create a genuine issue of material fact.</p>	<p>23 24 25 26 27 12. The reporting parties provided responding officers with a description of the area approaching their studio.</p> <p>28 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 11</p> <p>12. Undisputed</p>

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 13. When asked if there were weapons inside the studio, the reporting parties informed officers that while there were no firearms, the intruder had access to sharp scissors and shears since they were in the textile/fabric industry. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 11	13. Disputed to the extent that the reporting parties told the officers that Decedent did not have any weapon on his person. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam Video at 08:20-10:20); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam Video at 3:20-6:00)
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 13. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' response does not controvert the stated facts. The PRs informed Officers that, while there were no firearms, the intruder had access to sharp scissors and shears in the studio. Plaintiffs instead reference whether a weapon was on the Decedent's person, which is not the fact asserted. There is no dispute as to the stated fact, which should be admitted. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew, 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 14. After the reporting parties signed the private-persons-arrest form, Sergeant Punzalan prepared a tactical plan, designating Officer Orozco as the contact officer, Officers Chomuk and Rodriguez as officers with authority to use less-lethal force, and Officers Quintero and Garcia as the arrest team. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 12	14. Disputed that the PR signed a private persons arrest form authorizing them to arrest the intruder. Further disputed to the extent that Orozco was designated as lethal cover. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 17:7-21); and Exhibit D (Orozco Interview at 10:19-11:3)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 14. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> The responding Officers' body-worn camera footage shows the PRs requesting the intruder's removal and authorizing a private person's arrest for trespass. (Exhibit B: Jauregui Body Cam Video at 09:42-10:00). The cited deposition testimony (Exhibit M: Quintero Depo. at 17:7-21) states only that the witness did not recall whether the form was physically signed.	
8 9 10 11 12 The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	
13 14 15 16 17 18 Though irrelevant to the resolution of any material fact, the record is clear that Officer Orozco was designated as lethal cover. (Exhibit D: Orozco Interview at 10:19-11:3; and Exhibit N: Punzalan Depo. at 13:17-19.) It is undisputed that Sergeant Punzalan did not designate Officer Garcia as lethal cover at the outset. (Exhibit I: Punzalan Int. at 22:10-11.) This fact does not present a genuine issue of material fact and is immaterial to the determination of whether the ultimate use of force was constitutionally reasonable.	
20 21 22 23 15. The responding Officers ascended the stairs to the fourth floor and positioned themselves approximately 35 feet away from the unit, the door of which was ajar. 24 25 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 13	15. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 16. Officer Rodriguez issued a callout, announcing the presence of the Los Angeles Police Department and issuing verbal commands for the suspect (Maccani) to exit with his hands raised. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 14	16. Disputed to the extent Decedent was also told to turn around facing away from the officers and walk backwards to the sound of the officer's voice. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 16. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' response does not controvert the stated fact. Plaintiffs merely note additional commands that were also given after the cited fact. There is no dispute as to the stated fact, which should be admitted.	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 17. The photograph accurately depicts the responding officers' positioning outside the studio immediately prior to Officer Rodriguez's callout. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 15	17. Undisputed.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 18. Within a few seconds of the callout, Maccani appeared in the doorway of the studio with his hands raised. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 16	18. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 19. He appeared disheveled and under the influence of an unknown narcotic. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 16	19. Disputed to the extent that Decedent was not under the influence of any narcotics as indicated in the toxicology test performed at autopsy. Further disputed to the extent that the officers had evidence that Decedent may be mentally ill, including based on his appearance, Defendant Garcia thought Decedent was probably going through some mental illness due to being on skid row and that is a common occurrence that he deals with quite often. Garcia also described Decedent's initial conduct as being very bizarre. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit F (Toxicology Report); Exhibit H (Defendant Garcia Int. at 7:20-9:14, 17:6-9, 63:9-64:5); Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:22-25, 13:3-22); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 70:7-20); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam Video at 08:20-10:20); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam Video at 3:20-6:00)
23 24 25 26 27 28 19. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Whether the Decedent was in fact under the influence is not material. The stated fact concerns the Officers' contemporaneous perception that the Decedent <i>appeared to be</i> under the influence. Plaintiff does not genuinely dispute that impression and instead suggests alternative explanations for the Decedent's behavior, which are irrelevant to the analysis and do not create a genuine issue of material fact.	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 20. Maccani momentarily complied with the Officers' commands to exit the studio, turn around, and walk backwards towards them with his hands raised. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 17	20. Undisputed
21. However, after taking a few steps, Maccani dropped his arms, abruptly spun around, and aggressively charged towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 17	21. Disputed to the extent that Decedent slowly walked towards the officers as opposed to aggressively charged towards them. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:1-6); and Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-13)
21. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent advanced on the Officers in defiance of their commands for him to stop moving. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 22. His facial expression was tense and hostile, with his eyes fixed on the officers as he moved quickly towards them. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 17	22. Objection. Calls for speculation and lacks foundation that his facial expression was tense and that his eyes were fixed on the officers. Disputed to the extent that Decedent slowly walked towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:1-6); and Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-13)
22. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> The statement does not call for speculation or lack foundation; it is based on Officer Garcia's contemporaneous observations of the Decedent. With respect to Plaintiffs' characterization of the Decedent's movements, attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent advanced on the Officers in defiance of their commands for him to stop moving. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 23. Officers continued yelling at Maccani to stop, yelling " <i>Hold on right–Hey! Hold on right there!</i> " but he continued to advance aggressively towards the Officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 18	4 5 6 7 8 9 23. Disputed to the extent that the officers did not continue to give commands as Decedent advanced towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); and Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 30:21-23)
10 11 12 13 14 23. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Attorney and witness descriptions of the Officers' commands do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera footage clearly captures the sequence of events in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. The body-worn camera footage clearly captures Officers making multiple commands for the Decedent to stop advancing towards them. (<i>See, e.g.</i> , Exhibit B: Jauregui Body Cam Video at 12:45-55.) The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g.</i> , <i>Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	10 11 12 13 14 23.
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 24. As Maccani charged towards the Officers, Officer Chomuk stepped away from the wall and deployed a 40mm less-lethal foam projectile round from approximately ten feet away, striking Maccani in the right stomach to lower rib area. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 19	20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 24. Disputed to the extent that Decedent slowly walked towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:1-6); and Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-13)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 24. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent moved towards Officers in defiance of their commands for him to stop moving. 8 9 10 11 12 The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'"'). 13	
14 15 16 17 18 25. As Officer Chomuk fired, Officer Rodriguez simultaneously fired one beanbag round from her Remington 870 shotgun from approximately eight feet away. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 20	25. Undisputed.
19 20 21 22 26. The beanbag struck Maccani in the abdomen. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 20	26. Undisputed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28
UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
27. The 40mm foam projectile and beanbag round are less-lethal force options designed to strike the suspect's body and cause pain without penetrating the body, in order to subdue the individual and enable officers to safely gain control.	27. Undisputed.

Evidence: Garcia Decl. ¶ 21

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 28. The Officers' attempts to deescalate and gain compliance using verbal orders and less-lethal force were unsuccessful. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 21	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28. Disputed that less-lethal force was unsuccessful. Officer Rodriguez, who fired the beanbag rounds, felt they were effective and may have assisted the officers to take Decedent into custody. Further, Sgt. Punzalan was able to go hands on with Decedent immediately after and a result of the second beanbag round being fired and striking and distracting the Decedent which allowed Punzalan the opportunity to physically grab Decedent bear-hug him while his back was facing Sgt. Punzalan. Punzalan did this to avoid the need for additional force, including lethal force. Therefore, it was unnecessary to shoot Decedent while Punzalan was going hands-on with the Decedent. Further, Garcia fired approximately within a second of the second beanbag round being fired so he did not allow for sufficient time to see if the second beanbag round was effective. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 42:10-45:12, 54:12-15); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 33:18-36:8); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 24:3-15, 31:6-11); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 25:3-24, 28:2-5)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 28. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that Officers attempted to deescalate and gain compliance using verbal orders and less-lethal force. It is further undisputed that those efforts did not achieve compliance. Plaintiff disputes whether less-lethal force was momentarily effective but does not controvert the underlying stated fact.	
8 9 10 11 12 29. After the 40mm foam projectile and beanbag rounds struck Maccani, he took a fighting stance, clenching both fists and turning his body so that his left side angled towards Officers as he approached them. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 22	29. Disputed. Decedent did not take a fighting stance and instead appears to be trying to use his arms to shield the less-lethal projectiles, which are being fired from a close range only a few feet away, from continuing to strike him in the torso/abdomen and appears to walk facing towards the officers without angling the left side of his body. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) (“to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers’ body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we ‘view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape’”)).	29. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Attorney descriptions of the Decedent’s movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the sequence of events in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. The still image included in Defendants’ Motion clearly depicts the Decedent angling his body while clenching a pointed object protruding from his fist. (ECF No. 51 at p. 4; Garcia Decl. at ¶ 23.)

1 30. He drew his left arm tightly
2 across his body in a guarded
3 fighting stance, while his right
4 hand remained clenched around
5 what appeared to be a pointed
object, which he held downward in
a striking position.

6 *Evidence:* Garcia Decl. ¶ 22

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
30. Disputed. Decedent did not
take a fighting stance and instead
appears to be trying to use his
arms to shield the less-lethal
projectiles, which are being fired
from a close range only a few feet
away, from continuing to strike
him in the torso/abdomen. Further
disputed that the object appeared
to be a pointy object. The object
Decedent was holding was a
white plastic fork, with the handle
protruding a few inches from the
bottom of his hand, which does
not have any point to it and does
not look like a pointed weapon.
Further, it is disputed that Garcia
or any officer, ever saw what was
believed to be a pointy object
since no one ever yelled “drop it”
or “he has a weapon” or words to
that effect, as officers are trained
to do if a suspect is holding a
sharp or pointy weapon so as to
notify his fellow officers and to
allow the suspect an opportunity
to discard any weapon. Especially
since Garcia claims to have seen
the object for 3-4 seconds
continuously. Even Garcia admits
having difficulty determining
whether the object was pointed or
not and does not remember there
being a point at the end of the
object or seeing the color of steel
or metal. Some of the officers
never saw a knife, or anything that
looked like a knife on Decedent
and the white fork does not
resemble a knife. Police officers,
such as Garcia, are trained on

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
	<p>4 identifying and distinguishing 5 objects and items in people's 6 hands and whether they are 7 weapons or not.</p> <p>8 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd 9 Video); Exhibit O (Photo of Fork); 10 Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 11 20); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 12 16:12-15, 20:2-21:14, 39:18-41:9, 13 45:15-19, 51:4-52:22, 60:3-17, 14 66:22-67:12, 72:15-22, and 78:7- 15 16); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 16 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L 17 (Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16, 18 40:2-4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. 19 at 25:11-17, 39:5-7); Exhibit Q 20 (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11- 21 14, 37:5-8); Exhibit U (Chomuk 22 Body Cam Video at 9:00-9:30). 23 See also Defendants' 24 Uncontroverted Facts No. 32</p>

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	30. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the sequence of events in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. The still image included in Defendants' Motion clearly depicts the Decedent angling his body while clenching a pointed object protruding from his fist. (ECF No. 51 at p. 4; Garcia Decl. at ¶ 23.) The fact that the object was ultimately determined to be a plastic fork is irrelevant because use-of-force analysis turns on what officers reasonably perceived at the moment force was used, not on facts learned later with 20/20 hindsight.
The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) (“to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers’ body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we ‘view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape’”)).	
Plaintiffs’ argument that none of the Officers called out that the Decedent had a weapon does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs concede that the encounter evolved in a matter of seconds, during which time multiple less-lethal rounds were deployed. This scenario left no meaningful opportunity for officers to verbalize a weapons warning. Although officers are trained, when time permits, to alert fellow officers and give a suspect an opportunity to discard a weapon by issuing commands such as “drop it” or “he has a weapon,” the absence of such warnings in this rapidly unfolding encounter does not undermine the Officers’ contemporaneous perception of a pointed object they believed was a knife or the reasonableness of their response.	
Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	31. Officer Garcia Alamilla believed the object clenched in Maccani's right fist was a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 22	31. Objection. Garcia's beliefs are not facts. Disputed that Garcia believed the object was a knife and it would be an unreasonable mistake for Garcia to believe that the white plastic fork was a knife. The object Decedent was holding was a white plastic fork, with the handle protruding a few inches from the bottom of his hand, which does not have any point or edge to it and does not look like a knife. Further, it is disputed that Garcia or any officer, ever saw what was believed to be a pointy object since no one ever yelled "drop it" or "he has a weapon" or words to that effect, as officers are trained to do if a suspect is holding a sharp or pointy weapon so as to notify his fellow officers and to allow the suspect an opportunity to discard any weapon. Especially since Garcia claims to have seen the object for 3-4 seconds continuously. Garcia also admits to never seeing the color of steel or metal. Some of the officers never saw a knife, or anything that looked like a knife on Decedent and the white fork does not resemble a knife. Police officers, such as Garcia, are trained on identifying and distinguishing objects and items in people's hands and whether they are weapons or not. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit U (Chomuk Body Cam Video at 9:00-9:30); Exhibit O (Photo of Fork); Exhibit P (Noble
---	---	---

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
		Declaration at ¶ 20); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 16:12-15, 20:2-21:14, 39:18-41:9, 45:15-19, 51:4-52:22, 60:3-17, 66:22-67:12, 72:15-22, 78:7-16); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 36:1-10, 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16, 40:2-4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 25:11-17, 39:5-7); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11-14, 37:5-8)
	31. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Officer Garcia's belief that the Decedent had a knife clenched in his fist is a fact corroborated by body-worn camera and surveillance footage and testimony from other responding Officers that they also observed what they believed to be a knife in the Decedent's fist. The fact that the object was ultimately determined to be a plastic fork is irrelevant because use-of-force analysis turns on what officers reasonably perceived at the moment force was used, not based on facts learned later with 20/20 hindsight.	Plaintiffs' argument that none of the Officers called out that the Decedent had a weapon does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs concede that the encounter evolved in a matter of seconds, during which time multiple less-lethal rounds were deployed. This scenario left no meaningful opportunity for officers to verbalize a weapons warning. Although officers are trained, when time permits, to alert fellow officers and give a suspect an opportunity to discard a weapon by issuing commands such as "drop it" or "he has a weapon," the absence of such warnings in this rapidly unfolding encounter does not undermine the Officers' contemporaneous perception of a pointed object they believed was a knife or the reasonableness of their response. Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 32. Maccani's movements and stance were aggressive and combative, protecting his body with his left arm while approaching Officers as if preparing to strike with the other (as depicted in the photograph above, with the red circle around the object Officer Garcia observed in Maccani's hand). 11 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 23 12	32. Objection, vague. Disputed that Decedent was combative because he never tried to punch, kick or strike any of the officers and never verbally threatened them. 13 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 45:6-10); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 41:3-10, 45:21-46:3); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 32:4- 10); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 28:25-29:10)
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 32. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> The statement of fact is not vague; the term "combative" clearly refers to the Decedent's physical resistance and aggressive conduct, including advancing toward Officers and failing to comply with commands, not solely to punching, kicking, or making verbal threats. Plaintiffs do not dispute that the Decedent approached Officers as if preparing to strike with his fist that clenched the pointed object Officer Garcia and others observed in Maccani's hand, which is circled in red in the referenced photograph. (Garcia Decl. ¶ 23.) Plaintiffs' objection attempts to redefine and limit the term "combative" and does not controvert the conduct described in the record and perceived by the responding officers.	
21 22 23 24 25 33. Maccani began yelling and rapidly and purposefully charged towards the Officers. 26 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 24	33. Disputed. Decedent walked slowly towards the officers. 27 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:1-6); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-13)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 33. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not dispute that the Decedent was yelling as he approached the Officers. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent moved towards Officers in defiance of their commands and use of less-lethal force.	
10 11 12 13 14 The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) (“to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers’ body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we ‘view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape’”)).	
15 16 17 Furthermore, Plaintiffs' cited evidence relates to the Officers' initial encounter with the Decedent, not the period after less-lethal force was deployed, which is the timeframe addressed by the stated fact.	
18 19 20 34. As he closed the distance, Officer Rodriguez deployed a second less-lethal beanbag round from less than one foot away. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 24	34. Undisputed.
21 22 23 35. The beanbag struck Maccani on his right forearm. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 24	35. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 36. This further use of less-lethal force also proved ineffective. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 24	36. Officer Rodriguez, who fired the beanbag rounds, felt they were effective and may have assisted the officers to take Decedent into custody. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 25:3-24, 28:2-5)
10 11 12 13 36. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that the deployment of a second beanbag round did not achieve compliance from the Decedent. Officer Rodriguez stated that after being struck with the second beanbag round, "he just quickly closed the distance," demonstrating that Decedent was unfazed by the second beanbag round. (Exhibit R: Rodriguez Int. at 25:3-8.)	
14 15 16 17 18 19 37. Maccani shrieked and barreled towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 25	37. Objection, vague. Disputed. Decedent walked slowly towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:1-6); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-13)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 37. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not dispute that the Decedent shrieked as he advanced on the Officers. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent moved towards Officers in defiance of both their commands and use of less-lethal force. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'"). Furthermore, Plaintiffs' cited evidence relates to the Officers' initial encounter with the Decedent, not the period after less-lethal force was deployed, which is the timeframe addressed by the stated fact.	37. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not dispute that the Decedent shrieked as he advanced on the Officers. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. It is undisputed that the Decedent moved towards Officers in defiance of both their commands and use of less-lethal force. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'"). Furthermore, Plaintiffs' cited evidence relates to the Officers' initial encounter with the Decedent, not the period after less-lethal force was deployed, which is the timeframe addressed by the stated fact.

1 38. As he advanced, Officer Garcia
2 again observed Maccani gripping
3 what appeared to be a white knife
4 in his right hand.

5 *Evidence:* Garcia Decl. ¶ 25

6 38. Disputed that Garcia believed
7 the object was a knife and it
8 would be an unreasonable mistake
9 for Garcia to believe that the
10 white plastic fork was a knife.
11 The object Decedent was holding
12 was a white plastic fork, with the
13 handle protruding from the
14 bottom of his hand, which does
15 not have any point or edge to it
16 and does not look like a knife.
17 Further, it is disputed that Garcia
18 or any officer, ever saw what was
19 believed to be a pointy object
20 since no one ever yelled “drop it”
21 or “he has a weapon” or words to
22 that effect, as officers are trained
23 to do if a suspect is holding a
24 sharp or pointy weapon so as to
25 notify his fellow officers and to
26 allow the suspect an opportunity
27 to discard any weapon. Especially
28 since Garcia claims to have seen
the object for 3-4 seconds
continuously. Garcia also admits
to never seeing the color of steel
or metal. The officers never saw a
knife, or anything that looked like
a knife on Decedent and the white
fork does not resemble a knife.
Police officers, such as Garcia,
are trained on identifying and
distinguishing objects and items
in people’s hands and whether
they are weapons or not.

25 *Evidence:* Exhibit E (Sync’d
26 Video); Exhibit U (Chomuk Body
27 Cam Video at 9:00-9:30); Exhibit O
28 (Photo of Fork); Exhibit P (Noble
Declaration at ¶ 20); Exhibit K

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28
UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
	(Garcia Depo. at 16:12-15, 20:2-21:14, 39:18-41:9, 45:15-19, 51:4-52:22, 60:3-17, 66:22-67:12, 72:15-22, 78:7-16); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 36:1-10, 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16, 40:2-4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 25:11-17, 39:5-7); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11-14, 37:5-8)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	38. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Officer Garcia's belief that the Decedent had a knife clenched in his fist is a fact corroborated by body-worn camera and surveillance footage and testimony from other responding Officers that they also observed what they believed to be a knife in the Decedent's fist. The fact that the object was ultimately determined to be a plastic fork is irrelevant because use-of-force analysis turns on what officers reasonably perceived at the moment force was used, not on facts learned later with 20/20 hindsight.
Plaintiff's argument that none of the Officers called out that the Decedent had a weapon does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs concede that the encounter evolved in a matter of seconds, during which time multiple less-lethal rounds were deployed. This scenario left no meaningful opportunity for officers to verbalize a weapons warning. Although officers are trained, when time permits, to alert fellow officers and give a suspect an opportunity to discard a weapon by issuing commands such as "drop it" or "he has a weapon," the absence of such warnings in this rapidly unfolding encounter does not undermine the Officers' contemporaneous perception of a pointed object or the reasonableness of their response.	
It is patently false to claim that no officers saw anything that looked like a knife on the Decedent. (<i>See, e.g.</i> Exhibit I: Punzalan Int. at 22:14-15; Exhibit L: Chomuk Depo. at 23:18-19; Exhibit M: Quintero Depo. at 36:2-3.) They believed based on what they saw that Decedent was holding a knife with his clenched fist.	
Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion to dispute this fact. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 39. Maccani's eyes were wide and fixed on the Officers with an intense, unbroken stare. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 25	9 10 39. Objection, calls for speculation and vague.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 39. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> The statement does not call for speculation and it is not vague; it is based on Officer Garcia's contemporaneous observations of the Decedent and describes what he saw. Plaintiff does not otherwise dispute this fact.	

1 40. In that moment, Officer Garcia
2 believed Maccani was preparing to
3 use the knife against them.

4 *Evidence:* Garcia Decl. ¶ 25

5 40. Objection. Garcia's beliefs are
6 not facts and assumes facts not in
7 evidence. Disputed that Garcia
8 believed the object was a knife
9 and it would be an unreasonable
10 mistake for Garcia to believe that
11 the white plastic fork was a knife.
12 The object Decedent was holding
13 was a white plastic fork, with the
14 handle protruding from the
15 bottom of his hand, which does
16 not have any point or edge to it
17 and does not look like a knife.
18 Further, it is disputed that Garcia
19 or any officer, ever saw what was
20 believed to be a pointy object
21 since no one ever yelled "drop it"
22 or "he has a weapon" or words to
23 that effect, as officers are trained
24 to do if a suspect is holding a
25 sharp or pointy weapon so as to
26 notify his fellow officers and to
27 allow the suspect an opportunity
28 to discard any weapon. Especially
 since Garcia claims to have seen
 the object for 3-4 seconds
 continuously. Garcia also admits
 to never seeing the color of steel
 or metal. The officers never saw a
 knife, or anything that looked like
 a knife on Decedent and the white
 fork does not resemble a knife.
 Police officers, such as Garcia,
 are trained on identifying and
 distinguishing objects and items
 in people's hands and whether
 they are weapons or not.

26 *Evidence:* Exhibit E (Sync'd
27 Video); Exhibit U (Chomuk Body
28 Cam Video at 9:00-9:30); Exhibit O

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
	(Photo of Fork); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 20); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 16:12-15, 20:2-21:14, 39:18-41:9, 45:15-19, 51:4-52:22, 60:3-17, 66:22-67:12, 72:15-22, 78:7-16); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 36:1-10, 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16, 40:2-4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 25:11-17, 39:5-7); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11-14, 37:5-8)

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	40. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that the Decedent had a white narrow object clenched in his fist with the pointed part of the object protruding from the bottom of his fist as he approached Officers. The fact that the object was later revealed to be a plastic fork is irrelevant to the use-of-force analysis.
Plaintiff's argument that none of the Officers called out that the Decedent had a weapon does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs concede that the encounter evolved in a matter of seconds, during which time multiple less-lethal rounds were deployed. This scenario left no meaningful opportunity for officers to verbalize a weapons warning. Although officers are trained, when time permits, to alert fellow officers and give a suspect an opportunity to discard a weapon by issuing commands such as "drop it" or "he has a weapon," the absence of such warnings in this rapidly unfolding encounter does not undermine the Officers' contemporaneous perception of a pointed object or the reasonableness of their response.	
It is patently false to claim that no officers saw anything that looked like a knife on the Decedent. (<i>See, e.g.</i> Exhibit I: Punzalan Int. at 22:14-15; Exhibit L: Chomuk Depo. at 23:18-19; Exhibit M: Quintero Depo. at 36:2-3.) They believed based on what they saw that Decedent was holding a knife with his clenched fist.	
Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion to dispute this fact. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 41. Maccani charged towards Officer Rodriguez, using both of his forearms to push her beanbag shotgun in a downward motion. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 26	41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098 1099 1099 1100 1101 1102 1103 1104 1105 1106 1107 1108 1109 1109 1110 1111 1112 1113 1114 1115 1116 1117 1118 1119 1119 1120 1121 1122 1123 1124 1125 1126 1127 1128 1129 1129 1130 1131 1132 1133 1134 1135 1136 1137 1138 1139 1139 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1149 1150 1151 1152 1153 1154 1155 1156 1157 1158 1159 1159 1160 1161 1162 1163 1164 1165 1166 1167 1168 1169 1169 1170 1171 1172 1173 1174 1175 1176 1177 1178 1179 1179 1180 1181 1182 1183 1184 1185 1186 1187 1188 1189 1189 1190 1191 1192 1193 1194 1195 1196 1197 1198 1199 1199 1200 1201 1202 1203 1204 1205 1206 1207 1208 1209 1209 1210 1211 1212 1213 1214 1215 1216 1217 1218 1219 1219 1220 1221 1222 1223 1224 1225 1226 1227 1228 1229 1229 1230 1231 1232 1233 1234 1235 1236 1237 1238 1239 1239 1240 1241 1242 1243 1244 1245 1246 1247 1248 1249 1249 1250 1251 1252 1253 1254 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1259 1260 1261 1262 1263 1264 1265 1266 1267 1268 1269 1269 1270 1271 1272 1273 1274 1275 1276 1277 1278 1279 1279 1280 1281 1282 1283 1284 1285 1286 1287 1288 1289 1289 1290 1291 1292 1293 1294 1295 1296 1297 1298 1299 1299 1300 1301 1302 1303 1304 1305 1306 1307 1308 1309 1309 1310 1311 1312 1313 1314 1315 1316 1317 1318 1319 1319 1320 1321 1322 1323 1324 1325 1326 1327 1328 1329 1329 1330 1331 1332 1333 1334 1335 1336 1337 1338 1339 1339 1340 1341 1342 1343 1344 1345 1346 1347 1348 1349 1349 1350 1351 1352 1353 1354 1355 1356 1357 1358 1359 1359 1360 1361 1362 1363 1364 1365 1366 1367 1368 1369 1369 1370 1371 1372 1373 1374 1375 1376 1377 1378 1379 1379 1380 1381 1382 1383 1384 1385 1386 1387 1388 1389 1389 1390 1391 1392 1393 1394 1395 1396 1397 1398 1399 1399 1400 1401 1402 1403 1404 1405 1406 1407 1408 1409 1409 1410 1411 1412 1413 1414 1415 1416 1417 1418 1419 1419 1420 1421 1422 1423 1424 1425 1426 1427 1428 1429 1429 1430 1431 1432 1433 1434 1435 1436 1437 1438 1439 1439 1440 1441 1442 1443 1444 1445 1446 1447 1448 1449 1449 1450 1451 1452 1453 1454 1455 1456 1457 1458 1459 1459 1460 1461 1462 1463 1464 1465 1466 1467 1468 1469 1469 1470 1471 1472 1473 1474 1475 1476 1477 1478 1479 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486 1487 1488 1489 1489 1490 1491 1492 1493 1494 1495 1496 1497 1498 1499 1499 1500 1501 1502 1503 1504 1505 1506 1507 1508 1509 1509 1510 1511 1512 1513 1514 1515 1516 1517 1518 1519 1519 1520 1521 1522 1523 1524 1525 1526 1527 1528 1529 1529 1530 1531 1532 1533 1534 1535 1536 1537 1538 1539 1539 1540 1541 1542 1543 1544 1545 1546 1547 1548 1549 1549 1550 1551 1552 1553 1554 1555 1556 1557 1558 1559 1559 1560 1561 1562 1563 1564 1565 1566 1567 1568 1569 1569 1570 1571 1572 1573 1574 1575 1576 1577 1578 1579 1579 1580 1581 1582 1583 1584 1585 1586 1587 1588 1589 1589 1590 1591 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1597 1598 1599 1599 1600 1601 1602 1603 1604 1605 1606 1607 1608 1609 1609 1610 1611 1612 1613 1614 1615 1616 1617 1618 1619 1619 1620 1621 1622 1623 1624 1625 1626 1627 1628 1629 1629 1630 1631 1632 1633 1634 1635 1636 1637 1638 1639 1639 1640 1641 1642 1643 1644 1645 1646 1647 1648 1649 1649 1650 1651 1652 1653 1654 1655 1656 1657 1658 1659 1659 1660 1661 1662 1663 1664 1665 1666 1667 1668 1669 1669 1670 1671 1672 1673 1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1719 1720 1721 1722 1723 1724 1725 1726 1727 1728 1729 1729 1730 1731 1732 1733 1734 1735 1736 1737 1738 1739 1739 1740 1741 1742 1743 1744 1745 1746 1747 1748 1749 1749 1750 1751 1752 1753 1754 1755 1756 1757 1758 1759 1759 1760 1761 1762 1763 1764 1765 1766 1767 1768 1769 1769 1770 1771 1772 1773 1774 1775 1776 1777 1778 1779 1779 1780 1781 1782 1783 1784 1785 1786 1787 1788 1789 1789 1790 1791 1792 1793 1794 1795 1796 1797 1798 1799 1799 1800 1801 1802 1803 1804 1805 1806 1807 1808 1809 1809 1810 1811 1812 1813 1814 1815 1816 1817 1818 1819 1819 1820 1821 1822 1823 1824 1825 1826 1827 1828 1829 1829 1830 1831 1832 1833 1834 1835 1836 1837 1838 1839 1839 1840 1841 1842 1843 1844 1845 1846 1847 1848 1849 1849 1850 1851 1852 1853 1854 1855 1856 1857 1858 1859 1859 1860 1861 1862 1863 1864 1865 1866 1867 1868 1869 1869 1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 42. Officer Rodriguez's head and back struck the wall as Maccani pushed her, pinning her against the wall. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 26; see also Exs. A and B thereto Chomuk Decl., Ex. A	42. Disputed that her head struck the wall or pinned her against the wall. Officer Rodriguez stated that she just recalls Decedent's hands near her abdomen/mid-section and does not even recall any physical contact. Rodriguez indicated she side stepped to the left, did not lose her balance, stepped back to create space and used her left hand to help take control of Decedent. Rodriguez also indicated that the barrel of her shotgun never made contact with anyone. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 11:8-13, 44:8-11, 50:1-7); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 6:13-7:10, 10:17-20
42. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> While Officer Rodriguez may not have noticed or recalled the precise sequence of events as the Decedent physically engaged with her, their encounter is clearly captured in Officers' body-worn camera footage. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g.</i> , <i>Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 43. Officer Rodriguez immediately pulled the beanbag shotgun away, causing Maccani to collide with his back against the north hallway wall. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 27	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 43. Objection calls for speculation. Decedent appears to push Officer Rodriguez away from him while turning clockwise and away from Rodriguez with his back up against the wall. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)
43. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> The statement does not call for speculation; it is based on Officer Garcia's contemporaneous observations of the Decedent. It is also captured on video. Plaintiffs do not otherwise dispute this statement of fact. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<p>44. Meanwhile, fearing for the safety of Officer Rodriguez, Officer Garcia unholstered his firearm.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 28</p> <p>44. Disputed to the extent that it was unreasonable for Garcia to unholster his gun based on any potential threat to Rodriguez's safety. Garcia was not assigned as the lethal cover, Garcia was assigned to the arrest team which was tasked with going hands-on and placing handcuffs on him. Further, Punzalan was going hands on with Decedent prior to the shooting and Rodriguez was using her left hand to try to control Decedent. Both these officers going hands on with Decedent further supports that lesser use of force options were feasible, available and far more appropriate to respond to any potential threat posed by Decedent. Further, Garcia was a rookie police officer who was still in the field training and probation period and such an inexperienced officer would never have been designated as the less lethal officer.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:6-8:23, 9:17-22, 15:6-12, 19:12-19, 22:4-11, 30:14-31:17, 35:13-20, 41:14-20, 43:5-44:18); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 13:1-14:20, 24:3-23, 31:3-35:13, 40:19-43:7); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 29:21-33:13, 44:1-18); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 33:18-36:14); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2nd Int. at 6:13-7:25)</p>
	<p>44. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not dispute that Officer Garcia unholstered his firearm because he was concerned for Officer Rodriguez's safety. Plaintiff does not dispute this fact, but instead</p>

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 argues—improperly—that it was unreasonable because he was not assigned as the legal cover and was a rookie. Those arguments are irrelevant to the question of reasonableness and whether the officer acted out of safety concerns. This fact should be deemed admitted.	
45. Sergeant Punzalan then grabbed Maccani's right arm just above the elbow. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 28	45. Undisputed.
46. As Sergeant Punzalan placed his right hand on Maccani's right bicep, Officer Garcia raised his pistol and fired one round from approximately three-to-six feet away toward center mass (chest/torso area). <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 28	46. Undisputed.
47. The round struck Maccani in the right upper arm and then his chest. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 29	47. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 48. Maccani screamed loudly but remained upright. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 29	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 48. Disputed that he voluntarily remained upright. Sgt. Punzalan bear-hugged Decedent and pinned him up against the wall before taking him down to the ground. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 9:17-20, 19:12-19, 35:13-20, 41:8-43:7)
48. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' response does not controvert the stated fact. The Decedent screamed loudly and remained upright at that moment.	
49. Sergeant Punzalan pushed Maccani to the wall; he and Officer Garcia thereafter took Maccani to the ground and handcuffed him without further incident. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 31	49. Undisputed.
50. As they were handcuffing Maccani, Officer Garcia verbally confirmed to the other Officers that he had fired a lethal-force round that struck Maccani. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 31	50. Undisputed.
51. The lethal shot was fired at roughly 14:28:48 in the body-worn-camera footage. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 31	51. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 52. Officers quickly rolled Maccani into a recovery position (on his side) and radioed dispatch to send an ambulance. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 32	52. Objection. Vague and ambiguous. Disputed that he was quickly rolled into a recovery position. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam at 13:00-14:00)
52. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not oppose entry of judgment in Defendants' favor on the Section 1983 denial-of-medical- care claim. Any dispute regarding the medical care provided to the Decedent is therefore immaterial to the resolution of the remaining issues raised in Defendants' Motion. In any event, the body-worn camera footage speaks for itself and accurately depicts when and what medical care was provided to the Decedent. The events depicted in the video amount to undisputed facts; videos as undisputed facts have been commonplace in this day and age of body cameras. (<i>See, e.g., Spencer v. Pew</i> , 117 F.4 th 1130, 1133 (9 th Cir. 2024), citing <i>Scott v. Harris</i> , 550 U.S. 372, 378 (2007) ("to the extent that the uncontested video evidence from the officers' body cameras establishes the timing and occurrence of events, we 'view[] the facts in the light depicted by the videotape'").	
53. Officer Garcia heard one of his fellow officers call for the rescue ambulance at roughly 14:29:57, just over a minute after the lethal shot was fired. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 32	53. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	1 2 3 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
4 5 6 7 8 54. Officer Garcia noticed Maccani had a chest wound after he was rolled into the recovery position and applied pressure to prevent him from bleeding out. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 32	4 5 6 7 8 54. Undisputed
9 10 11 12 55. Officer Orozco checked for a pulse on Maccani's neck. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 32	9 10 11 12 55. Undisputed.
13 14 15 16 56. He ordered that chest compressions be initiated, so Officer Garcia rolled Maccani onto his back, and performed chest compressions until another Officer took over. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 33	13 14 15 16 56. Undisputed.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 57. Los Angeles Fire Department personnel arrived at 14:35 hours and assumed medical care of Maccani, who was later pronounced deceased at the hospital at 15:12 hours. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 33	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 57. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
<p>7 8 9 58. After Maccani was transported and the scene was processed, it was discovered that the object he had been clenching in his fist was a plastic fork.</p> <p>10 11 12 13 <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 34</p>	<p>14 15 16 58. Disputed that the object in Decedent's hand looked like a knife. The object in Decedent's hand was a white plastic fork, which does not resemble a knife. The white plastic fork was seen on the ground immediately after the shooting, while the officers were handcuffing the Decedent.</p> <p>17 18 19 10 11 12 13 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 31:10-16, 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 20)</p>
<p>20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 58. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs' response does not controvert the stated fact. It is undisputed that after the scene was processed, the object clenched in the Decedent's fist was determined to be a plastic fork.</p> <p>17 18 19 Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion to dispute this fact. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.</p>	

1	59. Officer Garcia was unaware of	59. Disputed to the extent that the
2	this fact until after the shooting.	object in Decedent's hand was a
3	<i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 34	white plastic fork which does not
4		look like a knife. The handle of the
5		plastic fork was protruding from
6		the bottom of Decedent's hand,
7		which does not have any point or
8		edge to it and does look like a
9		knife. Further, it is disputed that
10		Garcia or any officer, ever saw
11		what was believed to be a pointy
12		object since no one ever yelled
13		"drop it" or "he has a weapon" or
14		words to that effect, as officers are
15		trained to do if a suspect is holding
16		a sharp or pointy weapon so as to
17		notify his fellow officers and to
18		allow the suspect an opportunity to
19		discard any weapon. Garcia also
20		admits to never seeing the color of
21		steel or metal. The officers never
22		saw a knife, or anything that looked
23		like a knife on Decedent and the
24		white fork does not resemble a
25		knife. Police officers, such as
26		Garcia, are trained on identifying
27		and distinguishing objects and
28		items in people's hands and
		whether they are weapons or not.
		<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd
		Video); Exhibit O (Photo of Fork);
		Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶
		20); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at
		16:12-15, 20:2-21:14, 39:18-41:9,
		45:15-19, 51:4-52:22, 60:3-17,
		66:22-67:12, 72:15-22, 78:7-16);
		Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 36:1-
		10, 47:4-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L
		(Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16,
		40:2-4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo.

UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
	at 25:11-17, 39:5-7); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11-14, 37:5-8)
<p><i>59. Moving Party's Response:</i> It is undisputed that the Decedent had a white narrow object clenched in his fist with the part of the object protruding from the bottom of his fist as he approached Officers. The fact that the object was later revealed to be a plastic fork is irrelevant to the use-of-force analysis.</p>	
<p>Plaintiff's argument that none of the Officers called out that the Decedent had a weapon does not create a genuine issue of material fact. Plaintiffs concede that the encounter evolved in a matter of seconds, during which time multiple less-lethal rounds were deployed. This scenario left no meaningful opportunity for officers to verbalize a weapons warning. Although officers are trained, when time permits, to alert fellow officers and give a suspect an opportunity to discard a weapon by issuing commands such as "drop it" or "he has a weapon," the absence of such warnings in this rapidly unfolding encounter does not undermine the Officers' contemporaneous perception of a pointed object or the reasonableness of their response.</p>	
<p>It is patently false to claim that no officers saw anything that looked like a knife on the Decedent. (<i>See, e.g.</i> Exhibit I: Punzalan Int. at 22:14-15; Exhibit L: Chomuk Depo. at 23:18-19; Exhibit M: Quintero Depo. at 36:2-3.) They believed based on what they saw that Decedent was holding a knife with his clenched fist.</p>	
<p>Plaintiffs also attempt to rely on expert opinion to dispute this fact. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not perciptient testimony and cannot create a genuine dispute as to what occurred or what was observed.</p>	

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 60. Surveillance video footage that fairly and accurately depicts the events that occurred in the fourth floor hallway on February 3, 2024 is attached as Exhibit A to Officer Garcia's declaration. The video, which was produced as DEF2520, contains no audio component and appears somewhat distorted as it uses a wide-angle lens. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 35 (erroneously numbered 31 on page 7)	60. Objection. Vague and ambiguous, also confusing and misleading. Disputed to the extent that the surveillance footage does not appear distorted. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)
60. <i>Moving Party's Response:</i> Plaintiffs do not dispute that the surveillance video fairly and accurately depicts the events on the date at issue, that it contains no audio, or that it was produced as DEF2520 and attached as Exhibit A to Officer Garcia's declaration. Plaintiffs' response disputes only whether the wide-angle perspective should be described as "distorted," which does not controvert the stated fact.	
61. The footage from Officer Garcia's body worn camera that fairly and accurately depicts the events that occurred in the fourth floor hallway on February 3, 2024, from the viewpoint of the camera affixed to his chest is attached to his declaration as Exhibit B . It was produced as DEF2521. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶ 36 (erroneously numbered 32 on page 7)	61. Undisputed.

1 2 3 UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	4 5 6 7 8 9 OPPOSING PARTY'S RESPONSE TO CITED FACTS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
10 11 62. The footage from Officer Chomuk's body worn camera that fairly and accurately depicts the events that occurred in the fourth floor hallway on February 3, 2024, from the viewpoint of the camera affixed to his chest is attached to his declaration as Exhibit A . It was produced as DEF2504. <i>Evidence:</i> Chomuk Decl. ¶ 4	12 13 62. Undisputed.

14
15
PLAINTIFFS' ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS

16 17 18 PLAINTIFFS' ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS	19 20 21 MOVING PARTIES' RESPONSES AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 63. With regards to the initial 911 call, Garcia did not have any information that anyone had been injured or that the suspect had a gun or a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 6:24-7:7, 24:19-22)	29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 63. Immaterial but undisputed, though Plaintiffs' Exhibit K does not include pages 6 or 7 of Defendant Garcia's deposition transcript, and those pages do not discuss the content of the initial 911 call.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	64. Upon arriving on-scene, the involved officers, including Garcia, spoke with the parties reporting (“PR”) who told the officers that the suspect told them to leave, he was saying weird stuff like the world is coming to an end, that he did not hit anyone, that he was being very antsy, that he was talking non-sense, that he did not have a weapon on his person like a gun or a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam at 8:00-10:30); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam at 3:00-5:30); Exhibit H (Garcia Int. at 7:17-22, 17:6-9); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 27:20-24, 46:8-47:2); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 15:18-24)	64. Disputed only to the extent the summary mischaracterizes the recorded interview. The recording reflects that the PRs stated that the Decedent told them the world was “changing” and they were asked about the Decedent’s access to a gun—not a knife—in the referenced BWC. The recording further reflects that the PRs advised the Officers that the Decedent had access to scissors and shears. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam at 10:28-10:35); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam at 5:30-5:42)
65. Sgt. Punzalan formulated a tactical plan that included a lethal-cover officer, a contact officer, two less lethal options (40mm and beanbag shotgun), a contact officer and the arrest team. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:6-8:23, 15:2-12, 22:2-11, 30:7-31:20, 36:5-12, 44:6-18); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 13:18-14:7, 32:20-35:18); and Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 29:21-33:13)	65. Disputed. Sgt. Punzalan stated that his designated team included a contact officer (Officer Jauregui); less lethal officer with the .40 (Officer Chomuk); a less lethal officer with the beanbag shotgun (Officer Rodriguez); a direct contact officer with lethal cover (Officer Orozco); and two arrest officers (Officer Garcia and Officer Quintero). <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. 15:8-12); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 14:21-24)	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	66. Garcia was part of the arrest team which is tasked with going hands on and placing handcuffs on the suspect. Sgt. Punzalan made sure that Garcia understood his assignment because it was important that he understood and followed the tactical plan. Garcia understood, based on his training, that if lethal was necessary that the other officer would be designated with that responsibility. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:6-8:23, 15:6-19:2-11, 22:2-11, 30:7-31:20, 44:6-18); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 13:1-14:20, 32:20-35:6); and Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 29:21-33:13)	66. Disputed only to the extent the summary mischaracterizes the recorded interview, where Sgt. Punzalan stated that tactics change depending on how the scene evolves. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 35:4-6)
	67. Because Garcia was still in his field training and probationary period as a new officer, he would not have been assigned as the lethal option and they would want someone with more experience with that assignment. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:6-8:23, 15:2-12, 22:7-11, 30:14-31:17, 44:6-18); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 13:1-14:20, 32:20-35:6); and Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 29:21-33:13)	67. Disputed only to the extent that Plaintiffs imply anything more than what Sgt. Punzalan testified to—that generally, as a supervisor, he would not have assigned a probationary officer to be lethal cover. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 33:3)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	68. Officers are trained on the importance of formulating tactical plans and following them and not deviating from them, including for the safety of both the suspect and the officers. Further, Garcia should have never deviated from the tactical plan and Garcia's deviation from the tactical plan was a significant factor in causing him to use deadly force against Decedent. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 22); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 22:19-25:6); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 19:12-20:12, 43:18-24)	68. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact. Additionally, Plaintiffs' mischaracterize Officer Quintero's testimony. He was asked if he was "trained on the importance of following [his] role in a tactical plan and not deviating from it, if safety allows. " To which he responded "Yes, sir. But if we have to deviate, then we're able to. " <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 22:19-23, <i>emphasis added</i>)
	69. The arrest team would normally be at the back of the configuration and the lethal and less lethal options would be to the front of the configuration. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 28:1-13)	69. Undisputed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	70. Based on the information on the call, the location being in the skid row area, the information provided by the PR and police officer training, the officers believed that they may be dealing with someone experiencing a mental health crises. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit H (Garcia Int. at 7:20-22, 9:2-14, 63:9-64:5); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 70:14-16); Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 7:22-25, 13:11-17, 28:20-29:19); Exhibit G (Chomuk Int. at 15:7-17, 63:18-64:6); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 12:7-10); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 7:14-20, 54:16-55:21); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 10:13-19, 22:21-23:6, 49:6-52:4); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 12:7-20, 30:12-15, 40:25-43:7); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 17)	70. Undisputed that officers considered the possibility that Decedent was experiencing a mental health crisis. However, this was not the sole factor. Officers also considered the information relayed by dispatch regarding a threatening individual, the reported conduct at the scene, Decedent's actions upon contact, and officer-safety considerations, all of which informed their response. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 4, 8; Exhibit A: CAD Printout at timestamp 14:14:25 2/3/2024.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	71. The officers planned to arrest Decedent for misdemeanor trespass if he refused to leave the property because after discussions with the PR the officers determined that an assault or a felony had not been committed. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 27:21-29:1); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 10:11-19, 15:16-16:21); Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 30:2-17); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 9:21-10:4)	71. Undisputed.

1	72. The plan was to safely take Decedent into custody with the minimal amount of force possible. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 16:11-21)	72. Undisputed.
2	73. The responding officers went to the end of the hall on fourth floor and began to issue commands for the Decedent to exit out of the unit. Decedent was initially compliant with the officers' commands. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit G (Chomuk Int. at 15:18-25, 58:18-59:1); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 32:3-14)	73. Undisputed.
3	74. The officers believed that Decedent appeared mentally ill based on his appearance and behavior. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 22:13-23:6, 49:18-52:4); Exhibit H (Garcia Int. 8:13-18); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo at 70:17- 20); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 31:1-9)	74. Undisputed that officers considered the possibility that Decedent was experiencing a mental health crisis. However, this was not the sole consideration. Officers also believed he may have been under the influence. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 4, 8; Exhibit A: CAD Printout at timestamp 14:14:25 2/3/2024.
4	75. During the morning roll call, there was a discussion with the involved officers regarding using less lethal when feasible rather than lethal. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 35:23-36:14); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 45:24-50:1)	75. Immaterial but undisputed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<p>76. After walking backwards with his hands in the air, as the officers ordered, Decedent lowered his hands, turned around and began walking slowly towards the officers.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit D (Officer Orozco Int. at 21:3-22:3, 23:11-24:16); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:11-15); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)</p>	76. Disputed. The body-worn camera and surveillance footage depict Decedent advancing rapidly toward the officers. Plaintiffs' characterization does not create a genuine dispute of material fact because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<p>77. Decedent was holding a white plastic fork in his right hand with the handle of the fork protruding a few inches from the bottom of his hand. The white plastic fork's handle did not have any point or sharp edge to it and does not look like a knife.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit O (Photo of Fork); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 20); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 31:12-16, 36:19-21, 47:23-48:6, 57:14-17); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 37:18-38:16); Exhibit Q (Quintero Int. at 29:10-17, 30:11-14)</p>	77. Disputed. The fact that the object was ultimately determined to be a plastic fork is irrelevant because use-of-force analysis turns on what officers reasonably perceived at the moment force was used, not on facts learned later with 20/20 hindsight. Defendants also object to Plaintiffs' alleged fact to the extent it contains argument. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	78. This is further supported by the fact that Garcia nor any officer, ever yelled “drop it” or “he has a weapon” or words to that effect, as officers are trained to do if a suspect is holding a sharp, pointy or edged weapon so as to notify his fellow officers and to allow the suspect an opportunity to discard any weapon. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 39:11-41:9, 45:15-19); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. 37:2-7); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 25:11-17, 39:5-7)	78. Disputed. Improper additional “fact.” This statement is argumentative and speculative, and it improperly asserts law-enforcement training, tactics, and officer intent without any evidentiary foundation. Plaintiff cites no admissible evidence establishing that officers are <i>required</i> to yell specific phrases in every circumstance involving a suspected weapon, nor that the absence of such statements proves a weapon was not perceived.
13 14 15 16 17 18	79. Especially since Garcia claims to have seen the object for 3-4 seconds continuously and he never told anyone at the scene that he thought that Decedent had a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 78:7-11)	78. Disputed. Improper additional “fact.” This statement is argumentative and speculative.
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	80. Garcia also admits to never seeing the color of steel or metal. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 78:7-11)	80. Immaterial but undisputed.

1	81. Sgt. Punzalan never saw what looked like a knife on Decedent. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 39:5-7)	81. Disputed. Sgt. Punzalan stated that the suspect appeared to be armed with a sharp object. The fact that he did not identify the object specifically as a knife is immaterial. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I: Punzalan Int. at 22:14-15
8	82. The white fork does not resemble a knife. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit O (Photo of Fork); Quintero Int. at 29:10-17	82. Disputed. Improper additional “fact.” This statement is argumentative and speculative. The officers believed it was a knife based on the fact Decedent held it with a clenched fist and they saw a point protruding.
13	83. Further, Police officers, such as Garcia, are trained on identifying and distinguishing objects and items in people’s hands and whether they are weapons or not. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 60:3-9)	83. Disputed. Improper additional “fact.” This statement is argumentative and speculative. Officers have to rely on their perceptions and information at the time, not with 20/20 hindsight.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	84. Decedent's arms and hands are down by his side as he initially slowly walks towards the officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	84. Disputed. The body-worn camera and surveillance footage depict Decedent advancing rapidly toward the officers. Plaintiff's characterization does not create a genuine dispute of material fact because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)
85. The officers then began to fire less lethal rounds at Decedent, including one 40mm round and one beanbag round. The officers did not give a verbal warning before firing any of these less lethal rounds. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 27:10-25); Exhibit Q (Quintero Depo. at 38:5-24)	85. Undisputed.	
86. These less lethal rounds appear to strike the Decedent. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 27:5-9, 36:2-4); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	86. Undisputed.	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	87. After the officers began to fire the less than lethal rounds at Decedent, he moved his arms to his abdomen and chest area, while continuing to slowly walk towards them. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit D (Orozco Int. at 23:5-13; 24:6-16); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:20-24)	87. Disputed. The body-worn camera and surveillance footage depict Decedent advancing rapidly toward the officers. Plaintiff's characterization does not create a genuine dispute of material fact because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage clearly capture the Decedent's movements. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)
	88. A second beanbag round is then fired at Decedent, which also appears to strike him. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit D (Orozco Int. at 23:17-24; 24:6-16)	88. Undisputed
	89. The 40mm and beanbag rounds are intended for subjects displaying a lower level of resistance than an immediate or imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury, which is the standard for using deadly force. At most, the officers should have used less lethal force. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 44:23-49:13); Exhibit T (Jauregui Depo. at 21:9-22:4); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 21)	89. Disputed. Improper additional "fact." This statement is argumentative and speculative. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	90. The less than lethal rounds were effective and assisted with the officers taking Decedent into custody. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 25:1-8, 28:2-5)	90. Disputed. The less lethal rounds did not result in obtaining compliance from the Decedent. It is undisputed that the Decedent moved towards Officers in defiance of their commands and use of less-lethal force. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶¶ 21 and 24
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	91. After the second beanbag round struck Decedent, he continued to briefly walk towards the officers and while near the wall, he pushed the officer holding the beanbag shotgun away from him with his left hand while turning clockwise away from the officer. While this was occurring, the officer holding the beanbag shotgun side stepped to the left, she stepped back to create distance and never lost her balance. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 50:1-7); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 6:16-7:7); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	91. Disputed only as to characterization. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage—whose contents are undisputed—clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	92. Decedent made minimal physical contact with the beanbag officer and she only recalls maybe Decedent touching her around her abdomen/midsection area but does not actually recall any physical contact with Decedent. Further, the officer does not recall Decedent making any physical contact with the barrel of her shotgun. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit R (Rodriguez Int. at 11:4-13, 44:8-15); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 10:17-20)	92. Disputed only as to characterization. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage—whose contents are undisputed—clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)
	93. As Decedent spun clockwise, and away from the beanbag officer, Sgt. Punzalan saw an opportunity and he went hands on with the Decedent and grabbed his arm and torso and bear-hugged him and pushed him towards the wall. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 9:17-20, 19:12-19, 35:13-15, 41:17-20, 43:5-10); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 6:22-7:7); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 24:3-17, 31:6-10, 42:21-43:4); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 33:18-36:12); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	93. Undisputed.

1	94. Officer Rodriguez (the beanbag officer) also used her left hand to help gain control of Decedent because she did not want Punzalan going hands on by himself. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 6:22-7:7)	94. Undisputed.
2	95. Punzalan went hands on with Decedent to de-escalate the situation because was dealing with a mental health issue, which is part of police officer de- escalation training, and to avoid the need for the additional or higher uses of force (including deadly force). <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 9:17-20, 19:12-19, 35:13-15, 41:17-20, 43:5-10); Exhibit S (Rodriguez 2 nd Int. at 6:22-7:7); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 24:3- 17, 31:6-10, 42:21-43:4); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 33:18-36:12); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	95. Disputed. Improper additional “fact.” This statement is argumentative and speculative.

1	96. While Punzalan and Rodriguez were going hands-on with the Decedent, Garcia fired a single gunshot which struck Punzalan in his hand and struck Decedent in the arm and chest. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. at 24:7-9); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 61:7-21); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 42:3-5); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 35:5-16); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	96. Disputed only to the extent Plaintiffs characterize Sgt. Punzalan's injury as a gunshot wound to the hand. The cited evidence shows the injury was a grazing wound, not a penetrating gunshot wound to the hand. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 30:16-20)
10	97. The last beanbag round and the gunshot were fired within approximately one second of each other. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo 50:21-24, 63:2-11); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	97. Undisputed.
16	98. Garcia did not give a verbal warning that deadly force would be used prior to firing and he did not issue any commands, including to drop it, prior to firing. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit H (Garcia Int. at 60:18-21); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 17:9-14)	98. Irrelevant but undisputed. There was not time to issue a warning given the rapidly evolving situation.

1	99. Garcia could not see Decedent's hands or the fork in his hand, at the time of the shooting. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 69:21-23, 75:9-76:7)	99. Undisputed. Officer Garcia testified that the Decedent's body was blocking his view of the Decedent's hand and object clenched therein. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 75:9-76:7)
7	100. Decedent's hands were not in physical contact with any other officers or their weapons at time of shooting. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 33:14-16, 36:9-11); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	100. Disputed. Officer Garcia testified that the Decedent was in physical contact with Officer Rodriguez at the time he discharged his firearm. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 69:7-18)
13	101. Garcia estimates he was six feet away from Decedent (out of arms reach) when he fired. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 17:15-17)	101. Undisputed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	102. Decedent never held the white plastic fork above his head and he never made a stabbing or slashing motion while holding the fork. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 31:22-32:5); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 26:7-15); Exhibit T (Jauregui Depo. at 46:13-17); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 75:16-76:3); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	102. Disputed only as to characterization. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage—whose contents are undisputed—clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. at ¶¶ 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)
	103. The hallway where the incident occurred is well lit. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd Video); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 47:17-19)	103. Undisputed to the extent Plaintiffs' fact reference the lighting conditions of the hallway at the time of the incident.
	104. Garcia saw the white plastic fork on the ground and figured that must have been what Decedent had in his hands. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 20:12-21:14, 66:24-67:12, 72:14-21) <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 21:13-14, 66:24 – 67:12, 72:14-21)	104. Disputed only to the extent it mischaracterizes his testimony. He stated that after seeing the white fork on the ground, he “speculated” that it was what the Decedent had been holding. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 21:13-14, 66:24 – 67:12, 72:14-21)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	105. Decedent never grabbed or held an officer, he never tried to kick, punch or strike an officer, he never verbally threatened anyone and he did not use any profanity. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit I (Punzalan Int. 42:8-12); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 28:25-29:10, 32:14-16); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 41:3-10, 45:21-46:3); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 45:6-10); Exhibit E (Sync'd Video)	105. Disputed only as to characterization. Attorney and witness descriptions of the Decedent's movements do not create a factual dispute because the body-worn camera and surveillance footage—whose contents are undisputed—clearly capture the Decedent's movements in the moments leading up to Officer Garcia discharging his firearm. Maccani charged towards Officer Rodriguez, using both of his forearms to push her beanbag shotgun in a downward motion. Officer Rodriguez's head and back struck the wall as Maccani pushed her, pinning her against the wall. The video evidence shows this objective fact. It is immaterial and irrelevant that he never tried to kick, punch or strike an officer, he never verbally threatened anyone and he did not use any profanity. <i>Evidence:</i> Garcia Decl. ¶¶ 26, 31-32 (Exhibits A and B thereto); Chomuk Decl. at ¶ 4 (Exhibit A thereto); Exhibit B (Jauregui Body Cam); Exhibit C (Punzalan Body Cam)
---	--	--

1	106. Per the toxicology results taken at autopsy, Decedent did not have any illegal drugs in his system at the time of the incident. 4 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit F (Toxicology 5 Results)	106. Irrelevant and immaterial, but undisputed.
6	107. Garcia had several less lethal 7 options on his person including a 8 taser, OC spray and a baton, 9 giving a warning that deadly force 10 would be used and issuing 11 commands, including to drop the 12 knife, with sufficient time to 13 comply with the commands. 14 There were also several 15 additional less lethal options like 16 allowing the officers to continue 17 to go hands on with Decedent, as 18 they had already began to do 19 prior to the shooting (especially 20 since the officers outnumber 21 Decedent 7-1), the 40mm gun and 22 the beanbag shotgun. 23 <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit E (Sync'd 24 Video); Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. 25 at 18:9-13); Exhibit P (Noble 26 Declaration at ¶ 21)	107. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1	108. Despite already seeing another officer with his gun drawn (per the tactical plan), Garcia still unholstered his gun and fired in the direction of some of the police officers. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit H (Garcia Int. at 25:21-26:5)	108. Disputed only as to characterization. Although other Officers were in close proximity and physically engaged with the Decedent, Officer Garcia discharged his firearm at the Decedent, not “in the direction of” other Officers. Plaintiffs’ characterization is misleading and unsupported by the record.
8	109. Due to cross-fire concerns, Chomuk yelled out “cross fire” to the other officers immediately after the gunshot. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit G (Chomuk Int. at 17:23-18:5, 36:11-37:20); Exhibit L (Chomuk Depo. at 50:18- 51:10)	109. Undisputed.
15	110. According to the LAPD review board, by firing without a clear background/backdrop, Garcia placed the officers at greater risk of injury and/or death than the perceived threat posed by Decedent, even if he had been armed with an actual knife and not a plastic fork. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 19)	110. Disputed. Defendants object to the extent this statement includes hearsay, calls for speculation, and lacks foundation. This statement contains an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Further, any review of the shooting occurred after the fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<p>111. Despite all of the involved officers having firearms on their person, only Garcia fired a lethal round. Based on their observations, most of the officers did not even unholster their guns, and the other officers with their guns drawn never put their finger on the trigger and never pointed their guns at Decedent.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. 33:14-20, 58:13-15); Exhibit M (Quintero Depo. at 39:21-23); Exhibit D (Orozco Int. at 17:24-18:5, 24:23-25:5, 29:8-24); Exhibit J (Jauregui Int. at 11:1-7)</p>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<p>112. Prior to the incident, as a police officer, Punzalan has seen approximately sixty five suspects with knives in their hands and never fired his gun during those previous encounters.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 7:7 – 8:12)</p>

1	113. Other than Punzalan, who was shot in the hand by Decedent, no other officers were physically injured during the incident. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 64:10-13); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 30:16-20)	113. Disputed only to the extent Plaintiffs characterize Sgt. Punzalan's injury as a gunshot wound to the hand. The cited evidence shows the injury was a grazing wound, not a penetrating gunshot wound to the hand. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 30:16-20)
8	114. Garcia had not finished his six-month field training at the time of the incident. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 13:21-14:14)	114. Undisputed.
13	115. Garcia was fired from his job as a LAPD police officer as a result of firing his weapon during the incident. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 19:5-17)	115. Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the record. The assertion is speculative and improper. The cited evidence does not state that Officer Garcia was fired. Officer Garcia stated he was not able to complete field training for LAPD. He testified that he “believe[d] it was due to the background and foreground of [his] shooting.” Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 19:4-17).
22	116. Police officers such as Garcia, are trained that if they see a suspect with a weapon in their hand, such as a knife, to give a command to drop the weapon if feasible. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 16:12-22)	116. Undisputed.

1	117. Police officers such as Garcia, are trained in the concept of situational awareness and on identifying and distinguishing objects in suspects hands in order to determine if they are weapons or not. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 60:3-17)	117. Undisputed that officers are trained in situational awareness. Disputed that this training establishes that an officer must accurately identify an object in a suspect's hands in real time, or that failure to do so renders the use of force unreasonable. Plaintiffs' characterization improperly attempts to convert general training concepts into a legal standard.
9	118. Police officers such as Garcia, are trained that there must be an immediate or imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury in order to use deadly force. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 76:18-79:8); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 7:12-15)	118. Immaterial and disputed to the extent that Exhibit N does not state the asserted "fact."
16	119. Officers are trained that deadly force is only to be used when there are no other reasonable options, it is to be used as a last resort. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 76:18-79:8); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 7:12-15); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 12, 13, 15)	119. Disputed. The stated "fact" is vague and immaterial. Exhibit N and Exhibit P do not support the contention asserted. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	120. They are also trained that in terms of imminent or immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury, there has to be an ability, an opportunity, and an apparent intent to immediately cause death or serious bodily injury and that all of those things must be present in order for the officer to shoot. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 76:18-79:8); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 7:12-15); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 12, 13)	120. Disputed. The stated “fact” is vague and immaterial. Exhibit N and Exhibit P do not support the contention asserted. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	121. Officers are trained that an imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 76:18-79:8); Exhibit N (Punzalan Depo. at 7:12-15); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 12, 13)	121. Disputed. The stated “fact” is vague and immaterial, and the evidence cited does not support the contention asserted. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	122. They are also trained that subjective fear is insufficient to use deadly force. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 77:10-12); Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 14)	122. Immaterial and disputed to the extent Plaintiffs improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1	123. Officers are trained that a verbal warning should be given when feasible.	123. Immaterial but undisputed.
2	<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 77:13-16)	
3		
4	124. Officers are trained that seeing a weapon in someone's hand, that fact alone is not enough to use deadly force, there has to be more.	124. Immaterial but undisputed.
5		
6	<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 77:17-20)	
7		
8		
9		
10	125. Officers are also trained to have a reverence for human life.	125. Immaterial but undisputed.
11		
12	<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 78:24-79:1)	
13		
14		
15		
16	126. Police officers such as Garcia, are trained to give commands when feasible and to give the person an opportunity to comply with the commands when feasible.	126. Immaterial but undisputed.
17		
18	<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 77:13-78:6)	
19		
20		
21		
22	127. Police officers such as Garcia, are trained to make sure they have a clear backdrop/background before firing.	127. Immaterial but undisputed.
23		
24	<i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit K (Garcia Depo. at 78:20-23)	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<p>128. Officers are trained to control their emotions and to not panic when encountering situations similar this incident.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 14)</p>	<p>128. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.</p>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<p>129. Officer Garcia said there was nothing between him and Mr. Maccani when he fired his handgun, but the evidence shows that Sgt. Punzalan was between Officer Garcia and Mr. Maccani, that Punzalan had already grabbed Mr. Maccani and Punzalan was struck by Officer Garcia's round.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 18)</p>	<p>129. Disputed. This statement is an argumentative characterization, not a material fact.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.</p>
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<p>130. Officer Garcia's use of deadly force was excessive, objectively unreasonable and inconsistent with generally accepted police practices.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 20)</p>	<p>130. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.</p>

1	131. A reasonable police officer would not believe that a common plastic fork was a knife or an edged weapon. A reasonable officer would have realized that the object in Decedent's hand was not a knife or a sharp-edged weapon. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 20)	131. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.
9	132. Under these circumstances, Officer Garcia should never have deviated from the tactical plan and a reasonable officer under similar circumstances would not have deviated from the tactical plan. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 22)	132. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.
17	133. A reasonable police officer in these circumstances would not have used deadly force as Mr. Maccani did not present an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury and a reasonable police officer in Officer Garcia's position would not have fired their handgun at Mr. Maccani when Sgt. Punzalan was in his line of fire. <i>Evidence:</i> Exhibit P (Noble Declaration at ¶ 25)	133. Disputed. This statement is an impermissible legal conclusion and argumentative characterization, not a material fact. Plaintiffs also improperly attempt to rely on expert opinion. (Exhibit P: Noble Declaration). Expert opinion is not percipient testimony and cannot establish a material fact.

1 Dated: January 2, 2026

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

2

3

4

By: /s/ Susan E. Coleman

5

Susan E. Coleman

6

Lauren S. Dossey

7

Attorneys for Defendant CALEB
GARCIA ALAMILLA

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28